



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,197	02/17/2004	Chu-Kuo Wang	CFP-1773~1 (15722/436CIP)	9919
23595	7590	07/07/2005	EXAMINER	
NIKOLAI & MERSEREAU, P.A. 900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH SUITE 820 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			DURAND, PAUL R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3721	

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/780,197	Applicant(s) WANG ET AL.	
	Examiner Paul Durand	Art Unit 3721	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 May 2005.  
 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6 and 11 is/are pending in the application.  
     4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6 and 11 is/are rejected.  
 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12/20/2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
     a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
         1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
         2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
         3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
     \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cast et al (US 3,397,617) in view of Schadlich et al (US 4,515,303).

In regard to claim 6, Cast discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a magazine 12, for holding nails 13, housing 2, containing a cup shaped piston 204, which functions as a mandrel and a security device, an insert secured to the housing comprised of head 225 with a ring shaped frictional element 226 which frictionally secures the piston coming from the punching position, which the examiner asserts that the hold element of Cast is effectively an integral o-ring, not needing a groove to sit in, and as such is an art recognized equivalent to an o-ring and groove. Alternatively, Cast also shows in Figure 2, the use of an o-ring 126 formed in grooves 124 which frictionally restrains piston 104 (see Figs 1-3 and C4,L48 – C6,L49). What Cast does not disclose is the use of a solenoid to power the tool. However, Schadlich teaches that it is old and well known in the art to provide a nailer or stapler, with magazine 17, spring 11 and a solenoid 2, with a cup shaped mandrel in the form of armature 4 for the purpose of electrically driving a tool (see Fig.1 and C2,L44 – C3,L20). Furthermore, while both Cast and Schadlich teach the use of an integral cup and piston

Art Unit: 3721

assembly, the examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a separate cup receiving and mandrel means, since it has been held that constructing a formerly integral structure into various elements involves only routing skill in the art. *Nerwin v. Erlichman*, 168 USPQ 177, 179. Moreover, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the invention of Cast with a plurality of rings and grooves since it has been held that mere duplication of parts of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the invention of Cast with the solenoid driving means as taught by Schadlich and a plurality of grooves and rings for the purpose of electrically driving a tool and reducing tool recoil.

In regard to claim 11, the modified invention of Cast discloses the invention substantially as claimed as applied to claim 6 above except for the reversal of the cup and mandrel. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the invention of Cast with the insert and the cap reversed, since it has been held that a mere reversal of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Einstein*, 8 USPQ 167. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the invention of Cast with the solenoid driving means as taught by Schadlich for the purpose of electrically driving a tool.

***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 5/4/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant first argues that the frictional retention means taught by Cast is not the equivalent of the applicant's o-ring and groove combination. The examiner does not agree. From the MPEP § 2144.06 regarding substituting equivalents known for the same purpose:

In order to rely on equivalence as a rationale supporting an obviousness rejection, the equivalency must be recognized in the prior art, and cannot be based on applicant's disclosure or the mere fact that the components at issue are functional or mechanical equivalents. In re Ruff, 256 F.2d 590, 118 USPQ 340 (CCPA 1958).

The examiner asserts that the one-piece retention element as shown by Cast is recognized in the prior art as being an equivalent type based on its knowledge of being used in the prior art and not on the function or mechanical uses alone. Moreover, as states above, Cast also teaches that an alternative to the single pieced design is the use of an separate o-ring and groove type design used to retain a piston in a non-operating position, and as such the single piece embodiment of Cast is deemed to be an art recognized equivalent.

Applicant further argues that the use of two ring is more advantageous for developing a vacuum. While the applicant may have a specific reason for using multiple o-rings and grooves as it pertains to drawing a vacuum, the examiner asserts that using a plurality or the mere duplication of existing parts in an invention is not considered

novel in the art. Moreover, the examiner cannot find any support in the specification for the applicant's assertion of the use of a vacuum.

Therefore, for the reasons indicated above, the rejection is deemed proper.

### ***Conclusion***

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Durand whose telephone number is 571-272-4459. The examiner can normally be reached on 0730-1800, Monday - Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi I. Rada can be reached on 571-272-4467. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3721

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Paul Durand  
June 29, 2005

  
**Stephen F. Gerrity**  
**Primary Examiner**  
571-272-4460